UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,887	04/16/2004	Manatesh Chakraborty	133737-1	1420

23413 7590 11/18/2009

CANTOR COLBURN, LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103

EXAMINER	
WOLLSCHLAGER, JEFFREY MICHAEL	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1791	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/18/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/826,887	CHAKRABORTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JEFFREY WOLLSCHLAGER	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 August 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *9,11,21,23 and 27* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 10, 12-20, 22, 24-26 and 28-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment to the claims filed August 31, 2009 has been entered. Claims 1, 28 and 32 are currently amended. Claims 9, 11, 21, 23 and 27 remain withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-8, 10, 12-20, 22, 24-26 and 28-34 are under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 1, 3, 4, 15-20, 22, 24-26, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamatomo et al. (JP 2000-302877).

Note: citations from Yamatomo et al. JP 2000-302877 are provided from the previously provided English translation.

Regarding claims 1, Yamatomo et al. '877 teach a method for manufacturing PPE powder with improved particle size distribution comprising introducing powder that is unheated

into a compression mold and compression molding the powder at a sufficient pressure to raise the density and at a temperature of 5 – 200 °C. (claim 1; paragraphs [0007, 0008, 0017, 0019, 0022, 0026, 0027]). Yamatomo et al. '877 teach and suggest utilizing pressure, as required, to achieve a density within the recited range of 0.7 - 1.055 g/cc. (paragraphs [0008; 0019]). Further, Yamatomo et al. suggest that the resulting density of the product correlates with the pressure applied in the compression mold (paragraph [0027] examples 1-4; comparative example 5) thereby suggesting that the pressure applied in the compression mold is a result effective variable for controlling density. While Yamatomo et al. '877 teach the compression provides sufficient strength, Yamatomo et al. do not teach what the strength is of the material. However, it is noted that the density produced by Yamatomo et al. highly overlaps the disclosed density range. It is implicit, and supported by the evidence of record, that the compressive strength of the article correlates with the density.

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Yamatomo et al. and to have readily determined and optimized the required compression pressure for a given value of the compression temperature within the disclosed range of 5-200 °C in order to produce an article having the density required by Yamatomo et al.

As to claim 3, Yamatomo et al. '877 teaches employing temperatures within the claimed range and suggests utilizing pressure, as required as a result effective variable, to achieve a density within the disclosed and claimed range (e.g. claim 4). As such, it follows that the same claimed effects and physical properties would implicitly be achieved by the practice of the method.

As to claim 4, Yamatomo et al. '877 teach a density within the range of 0.7 – 1.055 g/cc.

As to claims 15-20, Yamatomo et al. '877 teach a range from 5-200 °C is suitable and preferably employ a heated mold during the compression molding (paragraph [0022]). The examiner notes that the sequence of performing the steps is *prima facie* obvious absent a showing of new or unexpected results.

As to claim 22, the compressed powder in tabular form set forth by Yamatomo et al. is understood to be a single phase compact (paragraphs [0026 and 0027]).

As to claim 24, the PPE powder disclosed by Yamatomo et al. has 60% of the particles with a size of less than 100 micrometers.

As to claim 33, Yamatomo et al. '877 exemplify a resin with an intrinsic viscosity of 0.53 dl/gm (paragraph [0026])

As to claims 25 and 34, Yamatomo et al. '877 disclose the particle size distribution of the particles, thereby suggesting an average within the claimed range (paragraph [0026]).

As to claim 26, Yamatomo et al. employ a confined pressure device (e.g. a mold with a piston and hydraulic compression that allows for an increase in pressure in the mold) (paragraph [0023]).

Claims 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamatomo et al. (JP 2000-302877), as applied to claims 1, 3, 4, 15-20, 22, 24-26, 33 and 34, above, and further in view of Modern Plastics Handbook, edited by Charles A. Harper, Knovel release date: November 20, 2002.

As to claims 2, 5 and 6, Yamamoto et al. do not expressly teach applying the pressure for a particular number of seconds. However, Modern Plastics Handbook discloses that the overall cycle times required for compression molding is determined based upon the molding

material, the thickness/size of the part to be produced and the mold temperature (6.2.3, last full paragraph).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have combined the teaching of Yamamoto et al. and Modern Plastics Handbook and to have optimized the required compression cycle time, including to times set forth in the claim, in order to achieve a compression molded product having the required density and size.

As to claim 6, Yamamoto et al. employ the same claimed starting material and disclose densities as high as 1.055 g/cc. Further, the combination set forth above suggests the same claimed process steps performed in the same claimed manner. Accordingly, the same claimed effects and physical properties (e.g. compressive strength) would intrinsically be achieved by the practice of the combined method.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamatomo et al. (JP 2000-302877) and Modern Plastics Handbook, edited by Charles A. Harper, Knovel release date: November 20, 2002), as applied to claims 2, 5 and 6 above, and further in view of Weiss et al. (US 5,294,667).

As to claim 7, the combination teaches the method set forth above. Yamamoto et al. do not expressly state the material is processed to remove or reduce gas trapped between the particles. However, Weiss et al. teach that compaction/compression molding of polyphenylene ether removes the air contained in the interstices of the loose powder which in turn reduces the proportion of fines and the risk of dust explosions (col. 2, lines 55-67).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have combined the teaching of Yamamoto et al. and Weiss

et al. and to have removed entrained air from the interstices of the loose powder in the method of Yamamoto et al. since Weiss et al. teach that compaction/compression molding intrinsically performs this function and the result is a product that has reduced fines and reduced risk of dust explosions.

Claim 8, 10, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamatomo et al. (JP 2000-302877), as applied to claims 1, 3, 4, 15-20, 22, 24-26, 33 and 34 above, and further in view of Gijzen (US 6,359,043).

As to claims 8, 10 and 12-14, the combination teaches the method set forth above. Yamatomo et al. '877 do not teach employing additives and/or binders as claimed. However, Gijzen teach that adding various additives and binders such as polystyrene resin enhance the properties of PPE (col. 1, lines 35-40; col. 3, lines 25-30).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Yamatomo et al. and to have employed additives and binders, as suggested by Gijzen, for the purpose of enhancing the properties of the product.

Claims 28, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamatomo et al. (JP 2000-302877) in view of Gijzen (US 6,359,043). *Note: citations from Yamatomo et al. JP 2000-302877 are provided from the previously provided English translation*

Regarding claim 28, Yamatomo et al. '877 teach a method for manufacturing PPE powder with improved particle size distribution comprising introducing powder that is unheated into a compression mold and compression molding the powder at a sufficient pressure to raise the density and at a temperature of 5 – 200 °C. (claim 1; paragraphs [0007, 0008, 0017, 0019,

0022, 0026, 0027]). Yamatomo et al. '877 teach and suggest utilizing pressure, as required, to achieve a density within the recited range of 0.7 - 1.055 g/cc. (paragraphs [0008; 0019]). Further, Yamatomo et al. suggest that the resulting density of the product correlates with the pressure applied in the compression mold (paragraph [0027] examples 1-4; comparative example 5) thereby suggesting that the pressure applied in the compression mold is a result effective variable for controlling density. While Yamatomo et al. '877 teach the compression provides sufficient strength, Yamatomo et al. do not teach what the strength is of the material. However, it is noted that the density produced by Yamatomo et al. highly overlaps the disclosed density range. It is implicit, and supported by the evidence of record, that the compressive strength of the article correlates with the density.

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Yamatomo et al. and to have readily determined and optimized the required compression pressure for a given value of the compression temperature within the disclosed range of 5-200 °C in order to produce an article having the density required by Yamatomo et al.

Further, Yamatomo et al. '877 do not recite employment of a binder. Gijzen teach that adding a binder such as polystyrene resin enhances the properties of PPE (col. 3, lines 25-30; Example).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Yamatomo et al. and to have employed a binder, such as polystyrene resin, as suggested by Gijzen, for the purpose of enhancing the properties of the product as is routinely practiced in the PPE art.

With regards to claim 28, the "consisting essentially of" language in the claims is noted. The transitional phrase "consists essentially of" limits the scope of the claim to the specified

materials or steps “and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics” of the claimed invention. In re Herz, 537 F.2d 549, 551-52, 190 USPQ 461, 463 (CCPA 1976). For search and examination purposed, absent a clear indication in the specification of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, “consists essentially of” will be construed as equivalent to “comprising.” When an applicant contends that additional steps or materials in the prior art are excluded by the recitation “consists essentially of,” applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of additional steps or components would materially change the characteristics of applicant’s invention. In re De Lajarte, 337 F.2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964). See also Ex parte Hoffman, 12 USPQ2d 1061, 1063-64 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989). Because no evidence has been set forth on the record to show that the use of additives besides polystyrene resin employed by Gijzen would materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the instantly claimed invention, its use is considered to fall within the scope of the instant claim.

As to claim 29, the polystyrene resin of Gijzen is heated, as part of its polymerization, prior to blending with the powder (col. 2, lines 60-65).

As to claim 31, the PPE powder disclosed by Yamatomo et al. has 60% of the particles with a size of less than 100 micrometers (paragraph [0026]).

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamatomo et al. (JP 2000-302877) in view of Gijzen (US 6,359,043). *Note: citations from Yamatomo et al. JP 2000-302877 are provided from the previously provided English translation*

Regarding claim 32, Yamatomo et al. ‘877 teach a method for manufacturing PPE powder with improved particle size distribution comprising introducing powder that is unheated into a compression mold and compression molding the powder at a sufficient pressure to raise

the density and at a temperature of 5 – 200 °C. (claim 1; paragraphs [0007, 0008, 0017, 0019, 0022, 0026, 0027]). Yamatomo et al. '877 teach and suggest utilizing pressure, as required, to achieve a density within the recited range of 0.7 - 1.055 g/cc. (paragraphs [0008; 0019]). Further, Yamatomo et al. suggest that the resulting density of the product correlates with the pressure applied in the compression mold (paragraph [0027] examples 1-4; comparative example 5) thereby suggesting that the pressure applied in the compression mold is a result effective variable for controlling density. Yamatomo et al. '877 do not expressly recite an example wherein the pressure and the temperature are within the claimed range at the same time. While Yamatomo et al. '877 teach the compression provides sufficient strength, Yamatomo et al. do not teach what the strength is of the material. However, it is noted that the density produced by Yamatomo et al. highly overlaps the disclosed density range. It is implicit, and supported by the evidence of record, that the compressive strength of the article correlates with the density.

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Yamatomo et al. and to have readily determined and optimized the required compression pressure for a given value of the compression temperature within the disclosed range of 5-200 °C in order to produce an article having the density required by Yamatomo et al.

Further, while Yamatomo et al. teach a wide range of molecular weights may be employed they do not expressly recite the claimed intrinsic viscosity.

However Further, Gijzen teaches a method comprising PPE within the claimed intrinsic viscosity range and that the intrinsic viscosity of PPE is chosen depending on the properties required in the product (col. 2, lines 51-59).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Yamatomo et al. '877 and to have employed a PPE within the claimed intrinsic viscosity range, as suggested by Gijzen, since Gijzen teaches that such PPE's are conventional in the art and that the intrinsic viscosity of PPE to be employed is chosen as a function of the desired physical properties of the product (i.e. intrinsic viscosity is a result effective variable).

Claims 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox (US 3,356,761).

Regarding claim 28, Fox teaches a method for forming melt processable polyphenylene ether (PPE) wherein polyphenylene ether powder and a liquid polymerizable material, such as styrene, (Example 1) are mixed together and compacted between two sheets of material (col. 4, lines 1-30) or cold-pressed (col. 5, lines 45-55) or press-cured at a temperature below the glass transition temperature of polyphenylene ether (col. 5, lines 35-43). The examiner submits all of these are reasonably understood to be compaction equipment comprising a compression mold as set forth in the instant disclosure. The liquid polymerizable material is a binder for the polyphenylene powder. Further, the examiner notes that the glass transition temperature of PPE is greater than 200 °C. Additionally, intrinsic to the compression operation is an increase in density of the article produced relative to the starting powder. The examiner notes that Fox does not specifically recite the compressive strength of the compression molded material, but Fox does provide information on the modulus and tensile strength of films and fibers produced by the method and these values suggest strength properties substantially above the recited value of 5 kg. Further, Fox teaches compressing the material as required to achieve the required thickness (Example 4).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Fox, and to have employed a pressure sufficient to achieve the recited compressive strength of 5 kg for the purpose of producing a film or fiber having the required strength properties and desired thickness.

As to claim 30, Fox teaches the liquid binder can be heated/devolatized prior to the mixture being press cured (col. 5, lines 35-42) and also teach the mixture may be dissolved in a common solvent and evaporated (col. 3, lines 21-24) to form the material that will ultimately be processed.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox (US 3,356,761), as applied to claim 28 above and further in view of Nitzsche et al. (US 2002/0198123).

As to claim 29, Fox teaches the method set forth above. Fox does not teach the claimed heating sequence. However, Nitzsche et al. teach a method of forming a composition that includes fillers, wax binders, foaming agents and liquids that are heated and then pelletized to form a composition that is subsequently blended with a thermoplastic resin (paragraphs [0014-0017 and 0029-0031]).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have modified the method of Fox and to have heated the binder prior to blending with the thermoplastic resin, as suggested by Nitzsche et al., for the purpose of effectively incorporating additives into the composition of Fox.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox (US 3,356,761), as applied to claims 28 and 30 above, and further in view of Yamamoto et al. (JP 2000-167827).

As to claim 31, Fox teach the method of claim 28 as set forth above. Fox does not teach that the powder comprises about 5 to about 70 percent of particles having a particle size less than 100 micrometers. However, Yamamoto et al. teach a compression molding process wherein 60 percent of the particles have a size of less than 100 micrometers (paragraph [0023]).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have employed the PPE disclosed by Yamamoto et al. in the method of Fox since Yamamoto et al. teach such a PPE is suitable for analogous compression molding applications.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 31, 2009 have been fully considered. Applicant's amendment to the claims has overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection and the 35 USC 102 rejection based upon Yamatomo et al. (JP 2000-167827). Further, applicant's amendment to claims 1, 28 and 32 has resulted in the withdrawal of Yamatomo et al. '827 in the 35 USC 103 rejection based upon Yamatomo et al. '877 for those claims.

Regarding Yamatomo et al. '877, applicant argues that there is no reasonable expectation of success based on the information of Yamamoto '877. In accord with this argument, applicant asserts, in the form of three graphs, that the examiner's logic regarding the relationship between pressure, density, and compressive strength cannot be applied to compressive strength. This argument is not persuasive. As an initial matter, the examiner

notes that Yamatomo et al. ‘877 disclose a temperature range (i.e. 5-200 °C) suitable for compressing PPE powder that overlaps with the claimed range. Further, Yamatomo et al. disclose and suggest, as generally applicable, a compression pressure range (of about 5-420 kg/sq. cm) which also overlaps the claimed pressure range.

Importantly, Yamatomo et al. is concerned with the resulting density of the compressed product after compressing it at any temperature within the disclosed temperature range of 5-200 °C. The examiner maintains that Yamatomo et al. suggest applying whatever pressure is needed for a given temperature within the disclosed range to achieve a density within the disclosed range. The examiner further maintains that Yamatomo et al. do effectively establish the relationship between pressure, density and strength.

Regarding the presented graphs, the examiner submits that based on the differences within the examples, only the graphs provided for a given subset of examples is directly applicable for analysis in view of the compressive strength being measured in units of "kilograms" (i.e. the results are not normalized). The examiner notes and submits that the size (i.e. the mass of PPE and the dimensions of the formed pellets of PPE in applicant's disclosure) of the different pellets from the different subsets of examples would be expected, as is shown in the combined chart, to require different amounts of force to cause them to disintegrate (although even in this combined chart there remains a positive correlation supporting the rejection). However, in the more applicable individual graph analysis from examples where the general size of the produced pellets are the same, the compressive strength does follow a highly correlated response to density as suggested by the examiner previously. The examiner submits this analysis, in view of the claims as they are currently presented, further supports the position previously set forth.

As such, the examiner submits and maintains that one having ordinary skill in view of the teaching of Yamatomo et al. would have found it obvious to use, for example, any of the disclosed pressures (i.e. Yamatomo et al. certainly had possession of pressures within the disclosed values) within Yamatomo et al. within the disclosed temperature range of Yamatomo et al. to produce a product having the required density of Yamatomo et al. Further still, the examiner submits and maintains that one having ordinary skill in view of the teaching of Yamatomo et al. would have found it obvious to have readily determined and optimized, through routine experimentation, a required compressing pressure for a given temperature within the disclosed temperature range of Yamatomo et al. to produce a product having the required density.

Accordingly, while the examiner does not submit there is no amendment that is applicable to overcome the fair teaching and suggestion of Yamatomo et al., the examiner does submit that the evidence of record supports that the fair teaching and suggestion of Yamatomo et al. continues to render the scope of the claims, as currently presented, *prima facie* obvious.

Further, while the examiner submits that Yamatomo et al. '877 in a narrow sense remains the closest prior art of record, it is noted that the previously cited Hanejko et al. (US 6,534,564) reference appears to remain quite pertinent to the instant claims in a somewhat broader sense (Abstract; col. 2, lines 46-62; col. 3, lines 5-37; col. 5, lines 62-66; col. 6, lines 8-15 and 27-40; col. 10, lines 47-67).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY WOLLSCHLAGER whose telephone number is (571)272-8937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:45 - 4:15, alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on 571-272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeff Wollschlager/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1791

November 17, 2009